

Report of the Accreditation Revisit to Hope International University and Accreditation Recommendation

Professional Services Division

June 27, 2002

Overview of this Report

This item includes a revisit accreditation recommendation and consists of two parts. First, a follow-up of the accreditation visit to Hope International University that was originally conducted April 1-4, 2001 is presented. The report about the revisit conducted March 3-5, 2002 included recommendations regarding three stipulations and a recommended accreditation status. Second, because the COA deferred action on the March 3-5, 2002 revisit and authorized a continuation of the revisit, a report of the June 4, 2002 continued revisit and the resulting accreditation recommendation is presented for consideration.

Recommended Action

1. On the basis of the March 3-5, 2002 revisit report and June 4, 2002 continued revisit report, staff recommends that the three stipulations placed on the institution by the Committee on Accreditation be removed.
2. Staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation change the accreditation status of Hope International University from **"Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations"** to **"Accreditation"**.

Rationale

During the March 3-5, 2002 revisit the team found that the institution had met Common Standards 1 and 5 and that Stipulation 1 had been satisfactorily addressed. Because Single Subject Program Standard 10 had not been met and two remaining Stipulations had not been satisfactorily addressed, pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, the Team made an accreditation recommendation of "Denial of Accreditation". During the April 24-25, 2002 Committee on Accreditation meeting staff recommended that action be deferred on the revisit team recommendation until the June 27-28, 2002 meeting. The Committee on Accreditation 1) deferred action on the revisit report, 2) granted an extension of time and a continued revisit to the institution and, 3) approved the withdrawal of the Hope International University Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program. During the June 4, 2002 continued revisit the team found that the institution had met the remaining Standard and satisfactorily addressed the remaining stipulations. The March 3-5, 2002 revisit report and the June 4, 2002 continued revisit report are included in this item for COA consideration and action as Attachments 1 and 2. The combined findings of the March 3-5, 2002 revisit report and the June 4, 2002 continued revisit report supports the team's accreditation recommendation of "Accreditation."

Background Information

2001 Accreditation Decision

The COA Accreditation team conducted an accreditation visit at Hope International University on April 1-4, 2001. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for the institution and its credential programs at its April 26-27, 2001 meeting: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

1. That Hope International University provide evidence of the development and maintenance of complete, accurate and up-to-date databases of program completers, current students including student teachers and master teachers.
2. That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications.
3. That the Institution provide evidence of implementation of a substantive process to meet all standards that are less than fully met.

Additionally, the COA required that Hope International University provide evidence that appropriate actions were taken to address each of the stipulations within one calendar year from the date of COA action. A focused revisit by the Team Leader and Commission Consultant was required to verify the appropriateness of the institution's actions.

The team made its original accreditation recommendation based on the findings and policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted as areas of strength and in other cases, area of concern. The team then decided on an accreditation recommendation for the institution. The areas of concern focused around Common Standards 1, 4, & 5 and Single Subject Program Standard 10.

Hope International University was required to respond to each stipulation and each standard that was judged to be less than fully met and prepare for a focused re-visit within one calendar year of the accreditation action. The revisit was scheduled for March 3-5, 2002. The institution prepared documentation indicating how the stipulations had been addressed and submitted the report to the Commission Consultant and Team Leader in January 2002. The institution also prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the Team Leader.

March 3-5, 2002 Accreditation Revisit

On March 3-5, 2002 the Commission Consultant and the Team Leader of the original team returned to Hope International University to conduct a focused re-visit. The revisit included extensive review of paper and electronic documents and interviews with constituents related to standards that were found to be less than fully met.

Prior to the accreditation revisit, the team received the institutional report which described the institution's efforts to remove all stipulations and meet all standards which were found to be not

fully met during the initial visit. The on-site phase of the revisit began on Sunday, March 3, 2002. The Team Leader reviewed documentation Sunday afternoon and developed additional questions for constituent groups. On Monday, March 4, 2002, the team collected data through interviews and review of institutional documents and electronic files according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. A total of 10 individual interviews were conducted, with some individuals interviewed multiple times. On Monday evening and Tuesday morning an accreditation revisit report was prepared and presented to the institution.

March 3-5, 2002 Accreditation Revisit Recommendation

Based upon extensive review of all pertinent documents and interviews with constituents, the Team Leader found that only Stipulation 1 had been satisfactorily addressed and Common Standards 1 and 5 were met. Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, Section 6, Continuing Accreditation Policies, D4, Accreditation with Stipulations, the team recommended that the accreditation status be changed from “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” to “Denial of Accreditation.”

Rationale for March 3-5, 2002 Revisit Recommendation

Section 6 of the *Accreditation Framework*, Continuing Accreditation Policies, D4, Accreditation with Stipulations, reads in part,

“The Committee on Accreditation allows an institution up to one calendar year to fulfill all standards or to discontinue deficient program(s). The Committee also determines how the institution’s response to adopted stipulations is to be reviewed. The Committee may require a second visit for this purpose. Failure to satisfy all stipulations results in the denial of accreditation to the entire institution.”

At its April 25, 2001 meeting the Committee on Accreditation adopted the accreditation team recommendation of “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.” Hope International University representatives were present for the COA’s decision and advised the COA that the institution had already begun work to remove the stipulations and to meet all standards. However, in September 2001 when the Team Leader and Commission Consultant were contacted by the new Chair of the Education Department for Hope International University, it became evident the institution had not begun efforts to clear stipulations and meet the standards until mid-September 2001. This was five months after COA action, and contrary to information provided by institutional representatives in April 2001.

Stipulation 3 required the institution to implement a substantive process to meet all standards less than fully met within one calendar year. The institution had from April 4, 2001, the final day of the initial accreditation visit, until March 2, 2002, to remove remaining stipulations and meet all standards. Although progress was made in removing Stipulation 1 and meeting Common Standards 1 and 5, at the time of the revisit a process for program evaluation was in-progress but not yet fully-implemented. Also, no action was taken in Spring 2001 following the initial accreditation visit to meet Single Subject Program Standard 10 and the institution provided no explanation of why this issue was not addressed at that time. Forms to appropriately monitor student teaching assignments were not devised until Fall 2001. However, there are no candidates currently enrolled in the Single Subject CLAD Emphasis professional preparation program and none will be enrolled in the future. Thus, there is no way the institution can meet Single Subject Program Standard 10.

April 24-25, 2002 COA Meeting

The revisit team findings from the March 3-5, 2002 Hope International University Revisit and accreditation recommendation of "Denial of Accreditation" were presented for consideration during the April 24-25, 2002 Committee on Accreditation Meeting. Although the *Accreditation Framework*, requires a team to recommend denial when an institution fails to remove all stipulations and meet the standards, Section 6 of the *Accreditation Framework*, D4, Accreditation with Stipulations, also allows the Committee on Accreditation to grant additional time for an institution to remove all stipulations and meet the standards. In addition to the COA team report and recommendation, an institutional request for additional time, until June 10, 2002, to remove remaining stipulations was submitted for consideration. The institution also requested withdrawal of the Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program, effective immediately.

Because this was the first time the COA was presented a team recommendation of "Denial of Accreditation" staff included the following options for COA consideration.

Option 1. Based on the findings outlined in the revisit team's accreditation report the Committee on Accreditation may vote to accept the team recommendation and change the accreditation status of Hope International University from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Denial of Accreditation".

The following excerpt from the *Accreditation Handbook*, Chapter 5, page 40, describes operational implications if the Committee on Accreditation votes to select Option 1.

Operational Implications

"An institution receiving Denial of Accreditation would be required to take immediate steps to close all credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the Committee on Accreditation decision took place. The institution would be required to file a plan of discontinuation within 90 days of the Committee's decision. The plan would give information and assurances regarding the institution's effort to place currently enrolled students in other programs or to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular program.

The institution will be required to announce that it has had its accreditation for educator preparation withdrawn. The institution would be enjoined from re-applying for accreditation (COA) for two years and would be required to make a formal application to the Committee on Accreditation which would include the submission of a complete institutional self study report including responses to the Common Standards and Program Standards. The self-study must show clearly how the institution has attended to all problems noted in the accreditation team report that recommended Denial of Accreditation. The Committee on Accreditation would make a decision on the status of the institution. If the Committee grants initial accreditation to the institution and its programs, a full accreditation visit will be scheduled within two years. "

Option 2. The Committee on Accreditation may vote to a) defer action on the revisit accreditation team report until its June 27-28, 2002 meeting, b) grant Hope International University additional time to remove all remaining stipulations, as per their request, and c) approve withdrawal of the Hope International University Single Subject CLAD Emphasis professional preparation program, effective immediately.

Operational Implications

If the COA votes to select Option 2 the institution may continue to offer its remaining programs with the accreditation status of “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” until the June 27-28, 2002 COA Meeting when the Committee on Accreditation makes a final accreditation decision.

After presenting the options for consideration, staff recommended that the Committee on Accreditation select Option 2 with the following Actions:

- That the institution provide evidence to the COA that appropriate actions have been taken to remove remaining stipulations, to be verified by the Team Leader and the Commission Consultant. A written report on actions taken to remove remaining stipulations must be received by the Commission Consultant no later than June 1, 2002.
- That a report on the findings regarding removal of remaining stipulations be presented to the COA at its June 27-28, 2002 meeting.

During the discussion of the item and staff recommendation, the COA expressed concern for students applying to the university during the interim between the April COA Meeting and the June COA meeting. This concern and discussion led to the addition of a third action under Option 2. That action directed HIU to give written notice to all incoming students of the program's status pending results of the June COA meeting. On April 25, 2002 the Committee on Accreditation voted to select Option 2 and the actions as described above. The March 3-5, 2002 revisit report is included as Attachment 1.

June 4, 2002 Continued Revisit

On June 4, 2002 the Team Leader of the original team and the Commission Consultant returned to Hope International University to conduct a continuation of the March 3-5, 2002 Revisit. The continued revisit was scheduled for one-half day and included review of documents and interviews with faculty and staff related to remaining Stipulations 2 and 3, Common Standard 4, and Single Subject Program Standard 10.

Prior to the continued revisit, the Team Leader and Commission Consultant received an institutional report which described the institution's efforts to remove remaining stipulations and meet the standards that were judged to be less than fully met. The report included analyses of the data gathered through nine survey instruments which were distributed to the various constituent groups. A description of the program changes made as a result of input was included in the report. It should be noted that while the institution has made no major programmatic changes at this time, a number of procedural, communication and assessment changes have been made.

During the on-site phase of the continued revisit, the Team Leader conducted a total of 5 individual interviews while the Commission Consultant reviewed data collected through the survey instruments. To verify compliance with the COA directive requiring notification of program status to program applicants, the Chair of the Education Department provided a copy of the letter used to notify prospective candidates of the institution's accreditation status. The Chair

informed the Commission Consultant that the letter was mailed to all those who applied to the program (3 as of June 4, 2002) as well as to all currently enrolled HIU teacher candidates.

The Team Leader determined that the institution cannot meet Single Subject Program Standard 10 because 1) no candidates have been enrolled in the program since Fall 2001, and 2) the program was withdrawn effective April 25, 2002. Therefore, the Team Leader asks the Committee on Accreditation to remove this Standard from consideration.

On Tuesday afternoon, June 4, 2002, an accreditation revisit report was presented to the institution. The continued revisit report is included on the following pages and is presented for consideration in conjunction with the March 3-5, 2002 revisit report. Based upon the findings of the Team Leader and the requirements of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Team Leader recommends that the accreditation status be changed from "**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**" to "**Accreditation**." The June 4, 2002 Continued Revisit report is included as Attachment 2.

ATTACHMENT 1

**MARCH 3-5, 2002 REVISIT
REPORT**

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
REVISIT ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: Hope International University

Dates of Revisit: March 3-5, 2002

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Denial of Accreditation

Rationale: On March 3-4 2002, the Team Leader, accompanied by the Commission Consultant, conducted a focused revisit. The focused revisit included attention to three stipulations that were approved by the Committee on Accreditation as well as three Common Standards and one Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program Standard that were found to be less than fully met by the original team.

The institution prepared documentation that responded to the stipulations and each of the standards that were less than fully met.

The Team Leader found that there continued to be change in personnel in leadership, faculty and staff positions since the initial visit. Some of the key personnel assumed duties over the summer of 2001 or at the start of the fall term 2001. These changes adversely impacted the institution's ability to resolve all the critical issues that were included in the initial team's report.

The Team Leader was encouraged by the professionalism of the new leadership team currently in place at the university. They successfully addressed many of the concerns expressed by the initial team.

The Team Leader reviewed documents and conducted extensive interviews as listed below. On the basis of that information the Team Leader recommends that Stipulation 1 be removed and decided that Common Standards 1 and 5 are now met. According to Section 6, Continuing Accreditation Policies, D4, Accreditation with Stipulations, of the *Accreditation Framework*, "Failure to satisfy all stipulations results in the denial of accreditation to the entire institution." Chapter 5 of the *Accreditation Handbook*, page 40, states "If an accreditation team is conducting a revisit to an institution that had received substantive stipulations as a result of a previous accreditation visit and the re-visit team finds that the stipulations have not been removed, the re-visit team must, according to the *Accreditation Framework*, recommend Denial of Accreditation"

In view of the progress that has been made by the new leadership team since September 2001, the Team Leader agonized over the accreditation decision the Framework requires. The Team Leader would have preferred to recommend the continuation of the current accreditation for a limited time period, however, the Team Leader had no choice in making a recommendation of Denial of Accreditation since the *Accreditation Framework* must be followed.

Based upon the findings of the Team Leader and the requirements of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Team Leader recommends that the accreditation status be changed from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Denial of Accreditation."

Team Leader: Jean Conroy
Retired Single Subject Coordinator

DATA SOURCES

	INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
2	Program Faculty	X	Institutional Response to Standards less than fully met
2	Institutional Administrators	X	Candidate Credential Files
2	Student Teachers	X	On-line Catalog and Addendum
1	Program Staff	X	Candidate and Graduate Electronic Files
1	Credential Analyst	X	Degree Audit Checklist
1	School Site Staff	X	Survey Instruments
1	Advisory Committee Members	X	Minutes of Advisory Committee

RESPONSE TO THE ACCREDITATION STIPULATIONS

Stipulations

- That Hope International University provide evidence of the development and maintenance of complete, accurate and up-to-date databases of program completers, current students including student teachers and master teachers. (Relates to Common Standard 1)
- That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications. (Relates to Common Standard 4)
- That the Institution provide evidence of implementation of a substantive process to meet all standards that are less than fully met. (Relates to Common Standards, 1, 4, 5, and Single Subject Program Standard 10)

Original Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 1

Common Standard 1: Education Leadership

Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Hope International University has developed its education programs to reflect the “Servant Leadership” mission of the school. This belief drives the instruction as well as the informal and formal advising/counseling with students. The administration, faculty, and students appear to embrace and model this concept.

The credential programs at HIU are located in a department within the School of Graduate Studies. The day-to-day operations of the teacher credential program are under the direction of the department chair. The department chair is responsible to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. There has been significant change in personnel in the leadership positions in recent years and roles may still be undergoing reshaping as the growth and needs of the program dictate. A strong leadership team appears to be developing.

The leaders of the program consistently bring together all faculty including adjuncts for faculty meetings so the total group becomes involved in curriculum discussions and decisions. The department chair, who also leads the multiple subject student teacher program, maintains a very close link with the student teachers and the university supervisors throughout the program.

While there are many fine qualities of this relatively new team there are also areas of concern that lead to the decision of “standard met minimally.” Professional preparation programs must be effectively organized, coordinated and managed so that all constituencies are provided the necessary support and assistance when required. Collection of required information from candidates such as CBEST scores is essential. Knowledge of candidate standing in the program is imperative so that the institution has provided complete and accurate information about each student. The Team Leader noted that there were areas of omission in preparing the documentation for this accreditation visit, as well as the preparation for the on-site visit for the accreditation team. Complete and accurate up-to-date information of program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers were not accessible in a timely manner. While “hands on” leadership in the classroom, in advising, and in program development issues are critical, and in this case exemplary, leadership in the development of accurate and easily accessible information is also critical as programs grow.

Revisit Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 1 Standard Met

The Team Leader interviewed the Director of Admissions and Information Management in the School of Graduate Studies, the credential analyst, the Education Department Chair and examined candidate and graduate electronic files. The Team leader determined that the institution has designed an access program that enables them to identify program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers and multiple subject graduates. The database for the graduates of the single subject program is maintained through a combination of electronic as well as paper files.

Under the direction of the Director of Admissions and Information Management the access program will be periodically updated to include changes in current information as well as information on new program applicants.

The initial team was encouraged by the many fine qualities of last year’s relatively new leadership team. The Team Leader is encouraged by the strength of the new leadership team which has been in place at the university since September 2001. They have made considerable progress in addressing the Stipulations and concerns expressed by the initial team. The Team Leader finds that there is leadership in not only the development of a database system but also in the coordination of other aspects of the credential programs.

The Team Leader found that since the initial visit the Department Chair, the Credential Analyst, the Single Subject Supervisor, and other key faculty have left the university. This history of personnel turnover has had an adverse effect on the ability of the institution to adequately address the accreditation stipulations. The team leader has been advised by the Provost that first steps have been taken by the institution to address the history of personnel turnover.

The Team Leader has determined that Common Standard 1 is now met and recommends Stipulation 1 be removed.

Original Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 4

Common Standard 4: Evaluation

Standard met Minimally With Quantitative Concerns

Informal evaluation is being done continuously. Student concerns have directly led to a number of program changes, e.g., change of times when credential courses are offered.

There is concern by the team that required evaluation data have not been systematically collected. The university needs to collect program evaluations from graduates, master teachers, employers, and community members. The master teacher does a thorough job of evaluating the student teacher but is not regularly given an opportunity to evaluate the university's teacher preparation programs. The university needs to track how both the formal and informal data is used in the program review process.

Revisit Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard **Standard Not Met**

The Team Leader interviewed the Education Department Chair and the faculty member who developed the new evaluation instruments. The Team Leader reviewed all the instruments and the limited number of surveys that have been returned, discussed the cursory review of the returned surveys, and interviewed one member of the advisory committee.

The Team Leader determined that the institution has established a multi-faceted evaluation process to obtain evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates, and community members. Based upon the interviews and review of files the Team Leader determined that some, but not all phases, have been fully implemented. The follow-up survey forms were mailed as recently as February 25, 2002, a week prior to the Revisit.

Due to the recent submission of surveys there has been in most cases only a cursory review of the data. There is no in-put from the follow-up surveys that were given to the graduates, their mentor teachers and site administrators.

An in-depth analysis of the various surveys has not been completed and the faculty has not had an opportunity to discuss the findings and how they might impact programmatic modifications.

The Team Leader finds that Common Standard 4 is not met. The Team Leader recommends that Stipulations 2 and 3 not be removed.

Original Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 5

Common Standard 5: Admission

Standard met Minimally With Quantitative Concerns

The current admission policy provides well-defined criteria and procedures for acceptance of candidates to credential programs. However, the policy is unclear about the state-mandated CBEST requirement. Evidence based on candidate, faculty, and staff interviews and review of candidate files give clear indication that the Commission policy on CBEST is not fully implemented.

Additionally, the institution must determine that candidates meet high academic standards as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement. Through interviews with institutional administrators, faculty and staff the team found that there is no comparison population identified that is used on one or more indicators of academic achievement.

Revisit Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 5 Standard Met

Based on an interview with the Director of Admissions and Information Management, who handles the final phase of application to the program, the Team Leader determined that the Commission's CBEST policy is fully implemented.

The Team Leader determined by reading the Revisit report and through an interview with the Director of Admissions and Information Management that a comparison population has been identified and utilized for GPA admission requirements.

The team leader has determined that Common Standard 5 is now met.

Original Team Findings and Decision on Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program Standard 10

Readiness for Diverse Responsibilities

Standard Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

The Single Subject program at Hope International University is a new program that was given initial accreditation by the COA in January 2000. As yet, there are no program graduates although there are student teachers. As with the Multiple Subject program, candidates spoke enthusiastically about the Hope International University program and their preparation for teaching English language learners. Candidates described how they modified the curriculum and provided access to all students.

All student teachers must be prepared to assume the responsibilities of full-time teachers, however, through interviews with student teachers, the team found that there is an unevenness of implementation of this standard. For example the team identified one student teacher who was assigned for only 2 periods per day.

Revisit Team Findings and Decision on Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program Standard 10

Readiness for Diverse Responsibilities

Standard Not Met

There have been only two Single Subject student teachers since the initial team visit. Both assignments were advanced student teaching placements and took place during module 2 of the Spring 2001 semester. Both individuals were interviewed. One was employed under an emergency permit and taught a full assignment at the school site. The second student taught two classes and only observed classes for the rest of the day which does not emulate the responsibilities and full day of a full time teacher.

In Spring 2001 there were nine students enrolled in the program. Five were recommended for the Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential and two dropped from the program. Through review of candidate files and an interview with the Department Chair it was discovered that the other two candidates completed professional preparation programs outside of the United States and are in the process of applying for certification directly to the Commission.

Beginning Spring 2002 the university is utilizing forms that detail the responsibilities of a student teacher. Since there have been no Single Subject student teachers since Spring 2001 the university has been unable to utilize this new form. It is unknown at this time whether there will be any future student teachers under the existing Single Subject program.

Based on the evidence presented the Team Leader finds that Program Standard 10 is not met and recommends that Stipulation 3 not be removed.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

The IHE is encouraged to review all advising materials and program forms to ensure that correct information regarding the need to take CBEST for admission to the program and the need to pass CBEST as an exit requirement is included.

After the evaluation surveys are analyzed the university needs to determine if the survey forms should be revised to provide more appropriate input to address program standards.

Review the surveys and program forms to determine if there should be separate forms for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs.

Develop a credential program brochure for each credential program which clearly and succinctly lists all program requirements.

Consider including a revision date on all documents used in program advising, etc.

ATTACHMENT 2

**JUNE 4, 2002 CONTINUED REVISIT
REPORT**

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
CONTINUED REVISIT ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: Hope International University

Date of Continued Revisit: June 4, 2002

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Rationale: The Committee on Accreditation (COA) voted on April 24, 2002, to defer action on the Hope International University (HIU) Revisit Accreditation Team Report until its June 27-28, 2002 meeting. HIU was granted additional time to remove all remaining stipulations and meet all standards that were less than fully met as per their request. The COA also approved withdrawal of the HIU Single Subject CLAD Emphasis professional preparation program, effective immediately.

On June 4, 2002, the Team Leader, accompanied by the Commission Consultant, conducted a continuation of the focused revisit. The institution prepared documentation on the stipulations and the standards that were determined to be less than fully met during the March focused revisit.

The Team Leader reviewed documents and conducted interviews as listed below. Single Subject Program Standard 10 is now moot since the Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program was withdrawn effective April 24, 2002. On the basis of data collected, the Team Leader determined that Common Standard 4 is now met and recommends that Stipulations 2 and 3 be removed.

Based upon the findings from the March 3-5, 2002, and June 4, 2002 focused revisit, the Team Leader recommends that the accreditation status be changed from "**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**" to "**Accreditation**."

Team Leader: Jean Conroy
Retired Single Subject Coordinator

DATA SOURCES

	INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
2	Program Faculty	x	Institutional Response to Stipulations and Standards less than fully met
1	Institutional Administrators	x	Survey Instruments
1	Credential Analyst	x	Survey Raw Data
1	Advisory Committee Members	x	Minutes of Advisory, Grad Academic, and Education Committees
		x	Resumes of New Faculty
		x	Revisions of Survey Forms
		x	Applicant Notification Letter

RESPONSE TO THE REMAINING ACCREDITATION STIPULATIONS AND STANDARDS NOT FULLY MET

This report includes findings only for those Stipulations and Standards that were judged as not met following the March 3-5, 2002 revisit.

STIPULATIONS

2. That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications. (Relates to Common Standard 4.)
3. That the Institution provide evidence of implementation of a substantive process to meet all standards that are less than fully met. (Relates to Common Standard 4, and Single Subject Program Standard 10.)

Original Team Findings and Decision on Common Standard 4

Common Standard 4: Evaluation

Standard Met Minimally With Quantitative Concerns

Informal evaluation is being done continuously. Student concerns have directly led to a number of program changes, e.g., change of times when credential courses are offered.

There is concern by the team that required evaluation data has not been systematically collected. The university needs to collect program evaluations from graduates, master teachers, employers, and community members. The master teacher does a thorough job of evaluating the student teacher but is not regularly given an opportunity to evaluate the university's teacher preparation programs. The university needs to track how both the formal and informal data is used in the program review process.

March 3-5, 2002 Revisit Team Findings and Decision

The Team Leader interviewed the Education Department Chair and the faculty member who developed the new evaluation instruments. The Team Leader reviewed all the instruments and the limited number of surveys that have been returned, discussed the cursory review of the returned surveys, and interviewed one member of the advisory committee.

The Team Leader determined that the institution has established a multi-faceted evaluation process to obtain evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates, and community members. Based upon the interviews and review of folders the Team Leader determined that some, but not all phases, have been fully implemented.

The follow-up survey forms were mailed as recently as February 25, 2002, a week prior to the Revisit.

Due to the recent submission of surveys there has been in most cases only a cursory review of the data. There is no in-put from the follow-up surveys that were given to the graduates, their mentor teachers and site administrators.

An in-depth analysis of the various surveys has not been completed and the faculty has not had an opportunity to discuss the findings and how they might impact programmatic modifications.

The Team Leader finds that Common Standard 4 is not met. The Team Leader finds that Stipulation 2 and 3 have not been removed.

June 4, 2002 Continued Revisit Team Findings and Decision

The development of a multi-faceted evaluation system was verified by the Team Leader during the March 2002 revisit. Based upon a review of the survey forms and the raw data, and interviews with faculty, the Team Leader determined as of the June continued revisit that all aspects of the evaluation system have now been implemented. Since many of the survey forms are administered in a classroom setting, there is a return rate of 100%. The follow-up surveys that were mailed to graduates of the program generated a return rate of approximately 30%. The per cent of master teachers who completed an evaluation of the student teaching program was not available.

The department chair verified that he is responsible for the analysis of the data for all but one survey. The Team Leader reviewed the analysis for all the surveys.

Through interviews with the credential analyst and 2 faculty members, the Team Leader was informed of steps that have been taken to address the issues that were identified in the various surveys as needing attention. The Chair of the Education Department informed the Team Leader that survey results will serve as a baseline for future surveys and program modifications. Although no major programmatic changes were made, a number of procedural, communicational and assessment changes are being made.

The Department Chair confirmed that continued support and resources to sustain the current and future evaluation process, as well as the Education Department, in general, has been pledged by the Board of Directors and the HIU President.

Original Team Findings and Decision on Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Program

Standard 10

Readiness for Diverse Responsibilities

Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

The Single Subject program at Hope International University is a new program that was approved by the COA in January 2000. As yet, there are no program graduates although there are student teachers. As with the Multiple Subject program, candidates spoke enthusiastically about the Hope International University program and their preparation for teaching English language learners. Candidates described how they modified the curriculum as provided access to all students.

All student teachers must be prepared to assume the responsibilities of full-time teachers, however, through interviews with student teachers the team found that there is an unevenness of implementation of this standard. For example the team identified one student teacher who was assigned for only 2 periods per day.

March 3-5, 2002 Revisit Team Findings and Decision

There have been only two Single Subject student teachers since the initial team visit. Both assignments were advanced student teaching placements and took place during module 2 of the spring 2001 semester. Both individuals were interviewed. One was employed under an emergency permit and taught a full assignment as his school site. The second student taught two classes and only observed classes for the rest of the day which does not emulate the responsibilities and full day of a full time teacher.

In spring 2001 there was a total of nine students enrolled in the program. Five were recommended for the Single Subject credential and two dropped from the program. Through review of candidate files and an interview with the Department Chair it was discovered that the other two completed full professional preparation programs outside of the United States and are in the process of applying for certification directly to the Commission.

Beginning spring 2002 the university is utilizing forms that detail the responsibilities of a student teacher. Since there have been no Single Subject student teachers since spring 2001 the university has been unable to utilize this new form. It is unknown at this time whether there will be any future student teachers under the existing Single Subject program.

Based on the evidence presented the Team Leader finds that Program Standard 10 is not met and Stipulation 3 has not been removed.

June 4, 2002 Continued Revisit Team Findings and Decision

Since this program has been withdrawn, effective April 24, 2002, this stipulation is now moot. The Team Leader recommends that this standard be removed from current consideration.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

As a result of the evaluation data, the institution is encouraged to develop a document that lists the criteria for being a master teacher,

All graduates of a program are eligible to be interviewed by accreditation teams. The institution is encouraged to find a way to include all graduates in the follow-up surveys, and not just those who are in a teaching position.